

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Remarks Regarding Amendments in the Claims:

Claims 30 to 36, 38 and 39 have been cancelled. Claim 40 is currently amended. The amendments are supported, for example, by page 3, line 28 to page 4, line 1 and Figures 2, 3 and 5. The Applicant submits that no new matter has been added.

Substance Of An Interview

With reference to items A to H listed in MPEP 713.04, the following is the Applicant's summary of the interview held by telephone on December 19, 2007 between the Examiner, Gregory J. Strimbu, and the agent for the Applicant, Scott Pundsack.

- (A) No exhibits were shown or demonstrations conducted.
- (B) Claims 30, 40 and a proposed claim 52 were discussed
- (C) GB 2,265,664, Barnes (U.S. 306,806) and Ausubel (U.S. 2,489,072) were discussed.
- (D) The principal proposed amendments are as described in the Interview Summary form signed by the Examiner.
- (E) The principal arguments of the Applicant were that (a) the figures show a reinforcing member larger than 80% of the height of a door, and that range is beyond the length of a reinforcing member that would be made according to the teachings of GB 2,265,664, and so such a numerical range was supported by the specification and distinguished the prior art, (b) that in the cited art having a reinforcing member with sides, the sides extend past the lockset which, coupled with teachings in the art emphasizing reinforcement of the lockset area, make a reinforcement extending substantially along the length of the door with sides not extending past the lockset non-obvious, and (c) that the device in GB 2,265,664,

even if fitted snugly, would not distribute forces applied to the door through a deadbolt along a side of the door without the use of screws.

- (F) No other pertinent matters were discussed.
- (G) The outcome of the interview was as stated in the Examiner's Interview Summary.
- (H) No electronic mail was involved in the interview.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112

Claim 30 and its dependents were rejected as being indefinite for various reasons. The current amendments cancel claim 30 and its dependents and the Applicant submits that these rejections no longer apply.

Claim 40 was rejected as being indefinite for recitation of "at least one lockset" in line 17. Claim 40 has been amended to refer to "the at least one lockset", referring back to the at least one lockset previously mentioned in the claim. To the extent that any of the rejections of claim 30 may have also applied to claim 40, the Applicant submits that the current amendments to claim 40 remove these grounds for rejection. The Applicant submits that claim 40 is not indefinite.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

Claims 30 to 35, 38 and 39 were rejected for obviousness. Since these claims have been cancelled, the Applicant submits that these rejections no longer apply.

Claim 40 to 45 were rejected as being unpatentable over GB 2,265,664 in view of Barnes and Ausubel. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons given in the Applicant's previous submissions and for the further reasons provided below.

Claim 40 as amended states that the side members of the U-shaped reinforcing member are generally rectangular, extend substantially along the free vertical edge portion of the door, and have a distal edge (in relation to a proximal edge of

the side members that is connected to a base member of the U-shaped reinforcing member) that does not extend beyond a portion of the lockset protruding through the front surface of the door. None of the cited references describe a reinforcing member meeting these specifications. In particular, the plate (2) of GB 2,265,664 has apertures 7 and 20 (see Figure 4 and page 6, lines 10-15) to account for its side members extending past the lock and handle of a lockset. The device in Barnes does not have side members. The device in Ausubel is neither U-shaped, nor a reinforcing member. Referring to Figure 1 and column 1, lines 1-4 and 19-21, the plate in Ausubel is merely disposed on the door to prevent the formation of finger marks on the door adjacent the door knob. The plate has portions cut out of it to allow parts of the plate to extend beyond the doorknob. Since Ausubel does not teach a U-shaped reinforcing member, or even a security device, the Applicant submits that it would not be obvious to apply any teaching of Ausubel to GB 2,265,664. Further, even if a person skilled in the art were to remove portions of the side members of the plate in GB 2,265,664 as shown by Ausubel in place of the holes 7 and 20 of GB 2,265,664, portions of the side members would still extend beyond the lockset as they do in Ausubel.

For the reasons above, the Applicant submits that claim 40 is not obvious. Claims 41-46, 48 and 49 depend on claim 40 and are also allowable for at least these reasons.

Respectfully submitted,
JAMES P. GRIFFIN, Jr. et al.

By Scott R. Pundsack
Scott R. Pundsack
Reg. No. 47,330
(416) 957-1698